

Appl. No.: 10/707,338  
Amdt. Dated: 3/5/2006  
Reply to Office action of: 01/04/2006

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

No amendments to the drawings are presented herewith.

Appl. No.: 10/707,338  
Amdt. Dated: 3/5/2006  
Reply to Office action of: 01/04/2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 17 remain in this application. New claim 18 has been added. New claim 18 is a dependent claim derived from original multiple dependent claim 4, such that both claims 4 and 18 are not multiple dependent claims. Claims 5, 15, and 16 have been amended to provide proper multiple dependent claim structure. In addition, claims 1 – 4 have been amended to overcome 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejections and objections by the Examiner, as well as incorporating the Examiner's suggestions as to suitable language.

The Examiner has acknowledged that claims 1 – 3 are directed to allowable subject matter. By this amendment claims 1 – 3 have been amended to overcome the objections and rejections of the examiner.

Applicant submits that the remaining dependent claims depending from claims acknowledged to have allowable subject matter are now also allowable.

Claims 5 – 17 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. Accordingly, the claims 5 – 17 have not been further treated on the merits.

Applicant traverses the objections. By this amendment Applicant has made Claim 4 a simple dependent claim depending only on claim 2 and introduced new claim 18 which is original claim 4 depending only on claim 3. Claims 5, 15, and 16 have been amended to depend solely on non-multiple dependent claims, namely 1, 2, 3, 4, and/or 18. Clearly, these claims no longer are in improper form under 37 CFR 1.75(c) and removal of said objections are respectfully solicited.

Claims 4 – 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner states:

The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In claim 3 and claim 4, applicants disclose the step of depositing additional extruded sheets (20b, ... 20n) on the first sheet (20a). However, in line 11 – 12 of claim 4, applicants recites a contradict limitation "applying said second plate (30) on the last sheet (20a, 20b, ... 20n)"

Appl. No.: 10/707,338  
Amdt. Dated: 3/5/2006  
Reply to Office action of: 01/04/2006

(emphasis added). Applicants clearly defines that the first sheet is labeled with reference number (20a) and the additional sheet (20b, ... 20n) is deposited after the first sheet (20a). Therefore, it is impossible for the first sheet (20a) become the last sheet if additional sheets (20b, ... 20n) are deposited over the first sheet (20a).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. By this amendment Applicant has amended claim 4, as well as new claim 18, to provide language which properly enables one skilled in the art to practice Applicant's claimed invention. Specifically, claims 4 and 18 have been amended to clearly state "... last of said sheets...". Thus, no matter the number of sheets (20a, ... 20n) applied it is to the "last of the sheets" that the claims now direct one skilled in the art. Applicant does not understand the reference to claim 3 in this regard as the language used as the basis of rejection does not appear in claim 3, but since claim 3 was not rejected Applicant makes no further comment. In light of these amendments and remarks claims 4 – 17 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited.

Claims 5 – 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement because they directly or indirectly depend on claim 4.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. By this amendment Applicant has amended claim 4 and added new claim 18 such that both claims are not multiple dependent claims. Thus, claims 5 – 17 now depend only on independent or simple dependent claims. In light of these amendments and remarks claims 5 – 17 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1 – 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states:

In line 2 of claim 1, the phrase "of the type" is subjective and indefinite. It is unclear from the claim what specific type that applicants wish to claim.

In line 17 of claim 1 the phrase "the material thereof" (in the phrase "so as to eliminate the material thereof") lacks antecedent basis. There are several different materials in the claim (electro-conductive material and dielectric substrate material). Therefore, it is unclear what

Appl. No.: 10/707,338  
Amdt. Dated: 3/5/2006  
Reply to Office action of: 01/04/2006

specific material that applicants wish to refer as "the material thereof".

In lines 19 – 20 of claim 1, the examiner does not understand the limitation "giving several finished tracks (13) isolated from each other as a result". It is unclear from the what specific result that applicants wish to claim

In line 19 of claim 4 the phrase "the material thereof" lacks antecedent basis for the same reason as discussed above.

In claims 1 – 4 the term "first sheet" lacks antecedent basis. The examiner suggests applicant replacing "first sheet" with – first heated sheet – as defined in line 27 of claim 1.

Claims 2 – 17 are indefinite because they directly or indirectly depend on indefinite claim 1.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. By this amendment Applicant has amended claims 1 and 4 to overcome all of the phraseology for which the rejection was based. The applicant also has amended all instances of "first sheet" to read – first heated sheet – per the examiner's suggestion. Applicant thanks the examiner for his suggestion and assistance. In light of the amendments to claims 1 and 4 claims 2 – 17 are now dependent on an allowable claim 1 and therefore are no longer indefinite.

In light of these amendments and remarks claims 1 – 17 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited.


Applicant thanks the examiner for the acknowledgement of allowable subject matter in claims 1 – 3 and has amended said claims to overcome all of the 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejections. In light of these amendments these claims are clearly in condition for a timely Notice of Allowance and such action is respectfully solicited.

Appl. No.: 10/707,338  
Amdt. Dated: 3/5/2006  
Reply to Office action of: 01/04/2006

Applicants acknowledge the prior art made of reference by the Examiner but not used as a basis of rejection. Because this art was not the basis of rejection Applicants make no further comment about said art.

In view of the remarks herein, and the amendments hereto, it is submitted that this application, and all of its claims, is in condition for allowance, and such action and issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce E. Harang  
Registration No. 29,720  
Tel.: (360) 903-4693